DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 203 IR 001 923

AUTHOR Pugh, Barbara E.
TITLE A Survey of Responsibilities of Indiana Public High School Audiovisual Personnel.
INSTITUTION Ball State Univ., Muncie, Ind. Dept. of Library Science.
PUB DATE Mar 75
NOTE 60p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Audiovisual Coordinators; Audiovisual Directors; Audiovisual Instruction; Credentials; Educational Needs; *Employment Qualifications; High Schools; Instructional Materials Centers; Librarians; *Media Specialists; Personnel Selection; *School Libraries; *School Personnel; Secondary Education; Surveys; *Task Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Indiana

ABSTRACT

To determine what educational background is needed by practitioners, a survey was conducted of audiovisual personnel in Indiana schools with enrollments of 1,000 to 2,000. A questionnaire was mailed to 104 schools and respondents asked to describe their responsibility for audiovisual equipment and software, budgetary duties, and production of audiovisual aids. Opinions on the value of inservice training programs and recommendations for course content in media-specialist college curricula were also sought. Titles of personnel, size of staff, and audiovisual budget by institution are included. Appendixes include the questionnaire and letter to respondents. (SK)

ED107203

A SURVEY OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF INDIANA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL AUDIOVISUAL PERSONNEL

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

BARBARA E. PUGH

ADVISER

KUANG-LIANG HSU

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

MUNCIE, INDIANA

MARCH, 1975

IR 001 923

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Introduction	1
II	Review of Related Literature	3
III	Method	9
IV	Findings	13
	A. Section I: Responsibility for AV Equipment	13
	B. Section II: Responsibility for AV Software	23
	C. Section III: Equipment Budgets	25
	D. Section IV: Production	26
	E. Section V: Competency	27
	F. Section VI: Recommended Course Content	29
	G. Section VII: Official Titles	33
	H. Section VIII: Training	34
	I. Section IX: General Information	37
V	Summary and Conclusions	42
VI	Bibliography	46
VII	Appendix	51
	A. Letter to Respondents	51
	B. Questionnaire	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Percentage of AV Personnel Who Have Responsibility for Selection, Ordering, Circulation, Storing, and Inventory of Audiovisual Hardware 14

Table 2 - Comparison of Responsibility for Selection, Ordering, Circulation, Storing, and Inventory of Audiovisual Hardware Showing Percentage of Responsibility for Library/AV People and AV People 15

Table 3 - Percentage of Respondents Reporting Operation of Equipment or Supervision of Said Operation 17

Table 4 - Comparison of Operation of Equipment or Supervision of Same Between Library/AV and AV Personnel 18

Table 5 - Percentage of Personnel Reporting Responsibility for Minor Repairs to Equipment 20

Table 6 - Minor Equipment Repairs Reported in Percentages by Library/AV and AV Personnel 21

Table 7 - Aggregate Percentages of the AV Person's Total Involvement with Audiovisual Equipment 22

Table 8 - Percentage of Responsibility for Software 23

Table 9 - Compared Percentage of Responsibility of Library/AV and Audiovisual Personnel for Software 24

Table 10 - Personal Involvement with Preparation/Production of Audiovisual Materials 26

Table 11 - Source of Competency in Audiovisual 28

Table 12 - Recommended Course Content: Production and Utilization 30

Table 13 - Recommended Course Content: Selection and Evaluation 31

Table 14 - Comparison of the Rank of Recommended Course Content 32

Table 15 - Training of Personnel 35

Table 16 - Training of Personnel Who Combine Library and Audiovisual Responsibilities 36

Table 17 - Training of Personnel Involved in Full-Time Audiovisual Responsibility 36

Table 18 - Average Professional Personnel per Media Center 39

Table 19 - Audiovisual Budget 40

Table 20 - North Central Requirements 41

Table 21 - Comparison of Actual Responsibility with Course Content Suggestions 42

Table 22 - Comparison of Operating Responsibility with Course Content Suggestions 43

I. INTRODUCTION

The role of high school librarian has demanded an increasingly close acquaintance with audiovisual production and equipment, and many librarians have indicated a need for additional depth of course content in the audiovisual field. The problem is to determine what background is really needed by the practitioners. This instrument was developed to elicit a conclusive response to that question so that coursework may be tailored accordingly.

During the past decade, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title programs have fostered a boom in audiovisual software, i. e., records, filmstrips, etc., for by virtue of these programs even the smallest schools have been able to purchase what were previously luxury items belonging to the technological age they could otherwise scarcely have afforded to enter. The terms of Title II, in fact, mandated a percentage expenditure in the audiovisual software field. Manufacturers of hardware, i. e., audiovisual equipment, were quick to take advantage of the situation and began offering "free" projectors with the purchase of a certain amount of software. An opportunity such as this was almost irresistible to smaller schools in particular. With local efforts supplemented by the government money, no school needed to be without the embryo of an audiovisual department.

This growing youngster quickly became the librarian's responsibility, and the concept of "librarian" began to shift toward "media specialist," or a similar portmanteau title. The phenomenal development of the audiovisual field created the need for librarians to re-tool their skills and learn to function in a world of machinery. With consolidation swelling enrollments, many schools found it expedient to obtain a specialist in audiovisual fields as well as a librarian. Since the two are interrelated in most universities, however, both may have an identical background. For this reason and because a large number of schools still employ one person to function dually, it is essential that library training programs keep current as to the practical needs of the jobs for which they are preparing personnel.

The results of this research will help provide accurate input to university personnel whose function it is to plan a comprehensive basic curriculum for school librarians. This research shows what audiovisual personnel in Indiana schools with enrollments from 1000 to 2000 really do and what skills they feel should be included in current professional preparation.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Research studies concerning school libraries are in comparatively short supply. Tobin found that only 16 out of 477 studies from 1960-1973 dealt with school library use.[1] Staff function in United States libraries was examined in 27 of 293 studies,[2] yet nothing similar to the scope of this present problem was researched.

Aaron reported on a five-stage depth study of 50 school media centers with an eye to determining reasonable standards for developing an effective program.[3] Dealing as it does with a cross-section of state, local, regional, and national libraries, it is beyond the range of this research in breadth yet not specific enough to provide helpful statistics.

Possibly the research paralleling this present one most closely was conducted by the School Library Manpower Project in 1969. It too is much more general and all-inclusive than is the intent of this study, although examining the instrument used[4] proved helpful. The library school

---

[1]Jane Culver Tobin, "A Study of Library 'Use' Studies," Information Storage and Retrieval, 10:103, March/April, 1974.

[2]Ibid., p. 109.

[3]Shirley Louise Aaron, "A Review of Selected Research Studies in School Librarianship," School Media Quarterly, 1:43, Fall, 1972.

[4]School Library Manpower Project, Task Analysis Survey Instrument.

curriculum developed from th. Manpower Project[5] is also beyond the scope of this research which seeks only to indicate needs and to relay suggestions from the battlefield back to headquarters.

Totten[6] castigated library schools in general for ignoring the fact of non-print media and neglecting to train students in their use. Hartz reached this conclusion also, stating that library schools were "not offering the training necessary to support the field of instructional media."[7]

The School Library Manpower Project concluded that school library media specialists must be able not only to select equipment but also to use and teach the use of all equipment.[8] However, as Ross D. Sackett pointed out,

> . . . developing the full potential of educational media means more than just setting up a projector and rolling a film. It means working closely with administrators, curriculum specialists, media experts, and classroom teachers. It means setting up the kind of in-service training that challenges educators to think in terms of innovation and creativity.[9]

---

[5]Marilynn S. Scott, "Competency-Based Evaluation for Media Personnel," Audiovisual Instruction, 19:45, June, 1974.

[6]Herman L. Totten, "Library Education and Non-Print Media: Where It's At," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 13:182, Winter, 1973.

[7]Herman Totten and Martin L. Mitchell, "Scope and Content of Non-Print Media Courses Taught in Graduate Library Schools," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 14:59, Summer, 1973.

[8]School Library Manpower Project, Occupational Definitions for School Library Media Personnel, p. 11.

[9]"Pennsylvania, Nebraska Educators Win 1974 Media Training Awards," Audiovisual Instruction, 19:66, June, 1974.

Perhaps it is overemphasis on this latter concept that caused Healey to denigrate the teaching of "how to" courses, saying that they should be taught to technicians instead.[10] Quinlan assumed a more balanced position when she suggested that a media professional should be able to do all things clerks do but must become a manager.[11]

Adams encouraged very close work between teachers and the audiovisual department to enhance curricular impact,[12] yet he headed upstream of his colleagues when he stated that local production is mostly a waste of time.[13] Gaver found close association between curriculum and production in her New Jersey study,[14] but, concluding that one person could not do it all, she suggested the need for two specialists.[15] Myers found a positive correlation between media centers and innovative programs only where audiovisual staff members were available,[16] and Gaver's findings of a positive relationship

---

[10]James S. Healey, "A Road to Media Relevancy," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 13:104, February, 1972.

[11]Iola Quinlan, "Developing Effective Library Media Centers--Now," Illinois Libraries, 55:483, September, 1973.

[12]Charles W. Adams, "The School Media Program: A Position Statement," School Media Quarterly, 2:129, Winter, 1974.

[13]Ibid., pp. 141-142.

[14]Mary Virginia Gaver, Services of Secondary School Media Centers, pp. 43, 74.

[15]Ibid., p. 93.

[16]Alpha S. Myers, "Media Centers and Innovation," Audiovisual Instruction, 18:80, March, 1973.

between the number of services and total number of paid staff[17] would tend to validate this.

Don Mayo, speaking at the 1974 AECT Convention, foretold increased individualized instruction, a rise in student-made materials, and more computerized or computer-assisted instruction, all of which calls for increased personal involvement on the part of the audiovisual staff.[18] Palmer cited the ideal production situation as consisting of three people:[19] a content expert, a librarian with time, incentive, and background; a communication expert, an audiovisual professional who can convert content to form; and a technician, who does the actual photographing and recording. She quoted a production engineer at Dallas Baptist College as saying that 300 man-hours go into a 20-minute slide-tape unit.[20] Nevertheless, the editors of Audiovisual Instruction make no apology when they insist that local production is the answer.[21]

Because of overlapping of positions in so many school libraries, it is almost impossible to find valid statistics

---

[17]Mary Virginia Gaver, "Services in Secondary School Media Centers: A Second Appraisal," School Libraries, 20:19, Fall, 1970.

[18]"Role of the Library Media Specialist," Audiovisual Instruction, 19:39, June, 1974.

[19]Millicent Palmer, "Creating Slide-Tape Library Instruction: the Librarian's Role," Drexel Library Quarterly, 8:252, July, 1972.

[20]Ibid., p. 251.

[21]"Local Production Revisited," Audiovisual Instruction, 18:4, November, 1973.

on employment. The U. S. Department of Labor reported that a 1972 study showed that "nearly half of all librarians work in school libraries."[22] More than half of Ball State University Library Science graduates take jobs in school libraries,[23] but no statistics are readily available as to size of school or specific assignment. Peterson's research of graduate degree recipients indicated that only 24 per cent of the 1973 graduates entered secondary schools in the audiovisual field.[24] The preceding year, 1972, showed 36 per cent entering secondary schools.[25] The Bureau of Labor Statistics cited a decrease in the need for librarians which began in 1970, an oversupply in 1972, and public libraries hiring more than school libraries in 1973.[26] This may explain the drop which Peterson reported.

Overall, a survey of the available literature tends to reinforce the sense of struggle between librarians and

---

[22]U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, News, January 16, 1975, p. 1.

[23]Interview with Dr. Marina Axeen, Chairman of the Department of Library Science, Ball State University, February 3, 1975.

[24]Gary T. Peterson, "Graduates of Media Programs in 1972-73," Audiovisual Instruction, 19:27, March, 1974.

[25]Gary T. Peterson, "Instructional Media Graduates 1971-72," Audiovisual Instruction, 18:42, May, 1973.

[26]U.S. Deaprtment of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, News, January 16, 1975, p. 1.

audiovisual proponents which Clark[27] and Totten[28] remarked upon. Totten stated elsewhere that ". . . library science educational programs offer few courses in non-print media, and very few curricula, if any, require students to obtain even an elementary background in this area."[29] No writer saw anything but a mushrooming future for the audiovisual aspect of education, and many practitioners shared the concern for adequate practical education which prompted this study.

The study at hand is a microcosmic view of what professional high school audiovisual personnel really are called upon to do in the performance of their jobs and, more importantly, an opportunity for them to prescribe courses which would be helpful to those who follow them through library training schools. Although limited in scope to only a certain size grouping in one state, the results of the study should be of vital interest to any library school whose graduates are certified as competent in both library and audiovisual fields. The unusually high percentage of return (76 per cent) and accompanying comments indicate a deep concern on the part of the respondents that their recommendations be heard and heeded.

---

[27]Geraldine Clark, "Secondary School Libraries, Problems, Problems, Problems," School Library Journal, 19:77, March, 1973.

[28]Totten, "Scope and Content," p. 65.

[29]Totten, "Library Education," p. 182.

III. METHOD

Data for this research were collected by means of a questionnaire[30] mailed to the person in charge of the school audiovisual program in the 104 Indiana public high schools whose student population falls between 1000 and 2000. Schools of this size were chosen because the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, of which all are members, mandates at least two full-time specialists in schools of 1500 or more, and schools between 300 and 1499 must have one full-time specialist in media.[31] The lower cut-off of 1000 provided approximately the same number of schools as the 1500 to 2000 group, and they were deemed large enough to have in their inventories most of the audiovisual equipment referred to in the questionnaire. The instrument reflected the basic operations of a school audiovisual department, allowing space for "write-in" additions. Throughout, the tabulations of answers from librarians who also have full or partial responsibility for audiovisual were kept separate from those of the people who serve as full-time or principally audiovisual personnel. Complete totals are used unless otherwise specified.

---

[30]See Appendix, pp. 51-55.

[31]Policies and Standards for the Approval of Secondary Schools, 1974-1975, p. 32.

Section I broke down the hardware responsibility of the audiovisual person into six categories: selection and ordering of equipment, scheduling and circulation, storing and inventory, responsibility for operating equipment, minor repairs, and major repairs. Fourteen of the more common equipment categories were listed, and all that was required was a check in the proper box indicating involvement with the process. The totaled statistics were similar enough in the first three groupings that they could be grouped together for statistical use.

Section II dealt with the extent of responsibility for budgets and other principal functions accruing to school library/audiovisual positions. As with the other checklists in the questionnaire, the tally was recorded on a master copy of each page and then turned into percentages.

The intent of Section III was to find out who might share in the budgetary responsibilities which ordinarily fall to librarians or audiovisual specialists.

Section IV sought to determine what kinds of creative teaching aids audiovisual people are being called on to help with. The basic ones were listed, and space was left for additions.

Section V was intended to assess past success by audiovisual and library training programs in providing necessary exposure to needed skills. Respondents were asked to number their replies in order of importance, and a priority tally was made.

Section VI provided opportunity for those actively engaged in the field to suggest course content which would help new professionals function more effectively in job situations. This was broken into fifteen related groupings and was to be checked for production, utilization and selection/evaluation of each. A number of respondents availed themselves of the comprehensive column, "all of these," and those answers had to be added into the proper column before an accurate count could be made. The count was then turned into percentages.

The seventh section dealt with title and the actual scope of the position. Section VIII called for the extent of professional training in library or audiovisual fields.

Sections VII and VIII required only tabulation by categories, but the audiovisual budget in Section IX defied easy charting because of the tremendous range of the data. A preliminary bar graph was made from the information so that it could be more easily examined.

The instrument did not require more than approximations in the areas of enrollment and budget, nor did it ask for the names of the schools responding. The picture of the individual operation measured in part by the foregoing information and in part by the information in this final section, i. e., size of school, size of library/audiovisual professional staff, and the audiovisual budget, was deemed sufficient for the purpose of this research.

Having been largely dictated by spatial needs, the sequence of the sections in the questionnaire is irrelevant.

It was felt that a questionnaire which was primarily a checklist would be more likely to be returned. The 76 per cent return of questionnaires yielded 68 per cent usable for this study. Those which were incomplete and those completed by non-professionals were disregarded along with a few others whose organizational patterns differed too greatly from the norm. Comments from these replies, however, were retained.

The paper is divided into sections corresponding to those of the questionnaire[32] so that the replies may be compared with the actual instrument more readily. The accompanying letter[33] was intentionally casual because this writer has known too many scholarly, dignified questionnaires to be filed in the waste basket upon receipt.

---

[32]See Appendix, pp. 52-54.

[33]See Appendix, p. 51.

IV. FINDINGS

A. SECTION I: Responsibility for AV Equipment[34]

Section I of the questionnaire was intended to ascertain what responsibility for audiovisual equipment the respondent had in six specific areas: selection and ordering of equipment, scheduling and circulation for use, storing and inventory, responsibility for operating the equipment (or supervising its use), minor repairs, and major repairs.

Totaled replies were similar enough to permit grouping of the answers in the first three categories, all of which are largely library-oriented. A look at the types of equipment helps explain the ranked order, since those toward the bottom are still "luxury" items in many places. Note also that these categories which will figure prominently throughout this study represent not only traditional "library" equipment but equipment from the fields of business machines, graphics, electronics, and photography.

---

[34]See Appendix, p. 52.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF AV PERSONNEL WHO HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR SELECTION, ORDERING, CIRCULATION, STORING, AND INVENTORY OF AUDIOVISUAL HARDWARE

Equipment	Percentage
Audio (disc/tape)	85
Projection (8mm, 16mm, 35mm, opaque, overhead)	82
Dry mount press	70
Video	60
Lettering	55
Transparency makers (thermofax, diazo, etc.)	54
Still cameras	50
Laminators	49
Duplicating (including thermofax, xerox)	44
Slide makers (copy stand, etc.)	44
Microform readers (microfilm/microfiche)	42
Movie cameras	40
Darkroom/photography	21
Filmstrip makers	14

The audio equipment, including as it does both record players and tape recorders, might well be expected to lead the list in high school involvement. Projection equipment runs a close second, but note that 60 per cent of the audiovisual people are also in charge of television equipment.

These responses were initially separated into two classes: those who were basically librarians functioning also as full or part-time audiovisual person and those whose primary responsibility was audiovisual. The two groups were tabulated separately before a total was arrived at in every section of the questionnaire. Table 2 shows the percentage of the involvement of each group in the responsibilities shown in Table 1.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR SELECTION, ORDERING, CIRCULATION, STORING, AND INVENTORY OF AUDIOVISUAL HARDWARE SHOWING PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR LIBRARY/AV PEOPLE AND AV PEOPLE

Equipment	Percentage Lib/AV	AV
Audio (disc/tape)	54	46
Projection (8mm, 16mm, 35mm, opaque, overhead)	50	50
Dry mount press	53	47
Video	43	57
Lettering	43	57
Transparency makers (thermofax, diazo, etc.)	50	50
Still cameras	42	58
Laminators	61	39
Duplicating (including thermofax, xerox)	54	46
Slide makers (copy stand, etc.)	38	62
Microform readers (microfilm/microfiche)	79	21
Movie cameras	40	60
Darkroom/photography	28	72
Filmstrip makers	43	57

Considering that whether the respondent is a librarian-plus-audiovisual person or strictly an audiovisual person he may be expected to assume the same basic role, the number of close percentages is instructive. Note that projection and transparency making responsibility are actually listed as even 50 per cents. In other words, exactly as many library/AV as audiovisual people checked responsibility in these areas. Audio, dry mount, and duplicating are close enough to be considered major responsibilities of both categories of audiovisual personnel as well.

Some expected divergence in roles begins at this point, however. Notice that of the 60 per cent who have responsibility for the video equipment (see Table 1), responsibility

falls upon 14 per cent more audiovisual personnel than librarians who also perform audiovisual duties. Of the 44 per cent who are responsible for slide makers (see Table 1), nearly two-thirds are people with total audiovisual responsibility. The statistics on microform readers are likewise predictable. Of the 42 per cent who have responsibility for them (see Table 1), librarians control them more than three-fourths of the time.

The next two columns of Section I of the questionnaire were intended to measure activities which are usually thought of as purely audiovisual--the actual operation of the equipment (or supervision of those who have that responsibility) and the making of minor repairs such as bulb changes. The final column, major repairs, elicited a very low response, as expected. Only fourteen indicated responsibility, and most of these were qualified by a comment that indicated they merely saw to it that equipment was sent out to be repaired.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING OPERATION OF EQUIPMENT OR SUPERVISION OF SAID OPERATION

Equipment	Percentage
Dry mount press	79
Transparency makers (thermofax, diazo, etc.)	78
Audio (disc/tape)	75
Projection (8mm, 16mm, 35mm, opaque, overhead)	72
Laminators	60
Duplicating (including thermofax, xerox)	59
Lettering	56
Video	55
Slide makers (copy stand, etc.)	49
Microform readers (microfilm/microfiche)	47
Still cameras	45
Movie cameras	40
Darkroom/photography	29
Filmstrip maker	15

Table 3 shows the overall percentage of audiovisual personnel who must know how to utilize equipment. Noting that movie cameras, darkroom/photography responsibility, and the filmstrip maker rank at the bottom here, it is helpful to refer to their identical position in Table 1 also. This indicates that relatively few schools even own these items. The filmstrip maker, for instance, is new, expensive, and of real value only to a school which produces its own software on a large scale. The top ranking of the dry mount press must be understood against the wording of the question: "Are you responsible for. . . ?" not "How often do you use. . . ?" This study does not attempt to reflect amount of use but merely, if it is used, who must be able to make it work.

From Table 3 is seen that more than half of the middle-sized high schools require operating knowledge of all but the last few items in the table. The first four items are certainly "musts," and in the final analysis, most lamination is done in a dry mount press, and most duplicators are closely related if not identical to transparency makers. A number of respondents indicated that television was another department with which they had little to do. This helps explain the relatively low percentage of the video category in an era in which television is a very common teaching aid.

A further breakdown can be made by comparing the involvement in these processes of library/AV people with that of audiovisual personnel.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF OPERATION OF EQUIPMENT OR SUPERVISION OF SAME BETWEEN LIBRARY/AV AND AV PERSONNEL

Equipment	Percentage Lib/AV	AV
Dry mount press	49	51
Transparency makers (thermofax, diazo, etc.)	50	50
Audio (disc/tape)	53	47
Projection (8mm, 16mm, 35mm, opaque, overhead)	51	49
Laminators	52	48
Duplicating (including thermofax, xerox)	54	46
Lettering	41	59
Video	38	62
Slide makers (copy stand, etc.)	35	65
Microform readers (microfilm/microfiche)	79	21
Still cameras	34	66
Movie cameras	43	57
Darkroom/photography	30	70
Filmstrip maker	50	50

In Table 4, some areas show up clearly as being in the realm of the audiovisual rather than library/AV person-- cameras and photography, for instance. As an example, note that of the 40 per cent who operate movie cameras (see Table 3), 57 per cent are full-time audiovisual people. Of the 47 per cent who operate microform readers (see Table 3), 79 per cent are library/AV people. This underlines the division of duties which is to be expected between non-print and print orientation, microform materials being basically printed materials, of course. Approximately one-half of the equipment mentioned is run evenly by both library/AV and AV personnel.

Note that of the 15 per cent of professionals reporting utilization of a filmstrip maker (see Table 3), usage is evenly divided between those with library/AV responsibility and those who are strictly audiovisual. The use of the transparency makers is evenly divided as was responsibility for this item in Table 2. Others so close as to be considered equal utilization include the use of the dry mount press, audio recorders, projection equipment, and laminators. This positive correlation indicates that all aspects of the following pieces of equipment are principal concerns to both library/AV and audiovisual personnel: projectors of all types, transparency makers, audio (disc/tape) player/recorders, dry mount, and duplicators.

Table 5 shows the percentage of personnel who are expected to perform minor repairs such as bulb replacements on

equipment. This function includes at least knowing how to open the machine, change the bulb, and look wise when saying that it looks as if it had better be sent out for repair. Only equipment that is actually repairable is included; several respondents checked repairs that are never minor. Repairs to camera and photographic equipment were checked by only one-quarter of the respondents and are not included.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF PERSONNEL REPORTING RESPONSIBILITY FOR MINOR REPAIRS TO EQUIPMENT

Equipment	Percentage
Projectors (8mm, 16mm, 35mm, opaque, overhead)	82
Audio (disc/tape)	76
Microform readers	51
Duplicators	45
Transparency makers	41
Video	40

Some discrepancy seems to exist in the realm of projectors. In Table 5, 82 per cent reported being responsible for minor repairs to projectors, yet in Table 3 only 75 per cent claim responsibility for the operation of the projectors. A note on one reply, to the effect that the teachers not only run the equipment themselves but also store most of it in their departments, may help explain this difference.

There can be little doubt of the primacy of the two top item groupings in Table 5 if the findings of Tables 1 and 3 are to be trusted. Here is the seed of the fruit of this research: practitioners need to know how to run and make

minor repairs on all types of projectors and on scund equipment such as tape recorders and record players. Both library/AV and audiovisual personnel are affected by these findings, as Table 6 will show.

TABLE 6

MINOR EQUIPMENT REPAIRS REPORTED IN PERCENTAGES BY LIBRARY/AV AND AV PERSONNEL

Equipment	Percentage Lib/AV	AV
Projectors (8mm, 16mm, 35mm, opaque, overhead)	47	53
Audio (disc/tape)	48	52
Microform readers	78	22
Duplicators	44	56
Transparency makers	42	58
Video	36	64

Table 6 indicates that specialists working in strictly audiovisual capacities tend to average 5 per cent more repair involvement where projectors and audio equipment are concerned and 14 per cent more where duplicators and transparency makers are involved than the personnel who cover both library and audiovisual. Video repair falls not surprisingly to twice as many audiovisual people as combined library/AV, and the care and feeding of microform readers devolves upon library/AV people four-fifths of the time. By and large, however, Table 6 points out the basic fact that librarians who also serve as audiovisual personnel do nearly the same quantity of minor repairs as those who wear the label "audiovisual."

One last comparison may be helpful--an aggregate percentage of total involvement in audiovisual care, maintenance, and use. In other words, Table 7 is a summary of the per cent of involvement in the total selection and use of the more common types of audiovisual equipment.

TABLE 7

AGGREGATE PERCENTAGES OF THE AV PERSON'S TOTAL INVOLVEMENT WITH AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT

Equipment	Percentage
Projection (8mm, 16mm, 35mm, opaque, overhead)	79
Audio (disc/tape)	79
Dry mount press	65
Transparency makers (thermofax, diazo, etc.)	57
Video	52
Duplicators (including thermofax, xerox)	49
Laminators	48
Lettering sets	48
Microform readers (microfilm/microfiche)	47
Slide makers (copy stand, etc.)	41
Still cameras	41
Movie cameras	36
Darkroom/photography	22
Filmstrip makers	13

All aspects of audiovisual taken together, again the audio and projection equipment take a commanding lead over other equipment, and the more strictly photographic aspects take last place. From one-half to three-fourths of the audiovisual personnel deal with most of these items to at least some extent. As money is made available, new types of equipment will be added to school media centers, and someone in the library or audiovisual area will be expected to take over. One mode of preparation for such additions might well

be implementing the suggestion of one respondent who suggested that area workshops centering on equipment be established.

B. SECTION II: Responsibility for AV Software[35]

Section II of the questionnaire concerned itself with the extent of responsibility related to software, i. e., audiovisual materials. One final question relating to the equipment budget will be correlated to the answers in Section III. Table 8 tabulates the basic obligations of any librarian to his collection, allowing for three degrees of involvement.

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOFTWARE

	Percentages			
	Full	Partial	Not Involved	Total
Inventory of software	78	22		100
Circulation of software	73	26	1	100
Storing software	72	27	1	100
Selecting/ordering software	71	26	3	100
Cataloging software	64	24	12	100
Evaluating/previewing software	56	38	6	100
Setting up AV software budget	54	28	18	100

It seems strange that as high as one-fourth of the audiovisual personnel are only partially responsible for their own collections, as shown by the first four items in Table 8. These are essentials in the development of a resource or media center. The lower full responsibility rate on cataloging is partly attributable to the fact that several systems are

[35]See Appendix, p. 53.

centrally cataloged. The higher partial involvement rate on evaluating and previewing indicates involvement by other members of the school--usually faculty members. This is a healthy sign, but when it is seen that nearly one-fifth of the audiovisual personnel are not involved in setting up their own budgets for software, it is cause for some concern. Audiovisual specialists are presumably trained to function as such, and to withhold control of their funds is degrading.

The comparison in Table 9 between library/AV and audiovisual personnel answers to Section II might shed some light on the roles they currently fill in Indiana high school media centers.

TABLE 9

COMPARED PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF LIBRARY/AV AND AUDIOVISUAL PERSONNEL FOR SOFTWARE

	Percentage			
	Lib/AV		AV	
	Full	Partial	Full	Partial
Inventory of software	58	33	42	67
Circulation of software	60	41	40	59
Storing software	59	39	41	61
Selecting/ordering software	51	53	49	47
Cataloging software	58	50	42	50
Evaluating/previewing software	60	38	40	62
Setting up AV software budget	56	33	44	67

Note that only in selecting/ordering software does the audiovisual specialist approach the 50 per cent mark. That means that only half of the audiovisual full-time people have full control over their ordering program. Their average is lower in all other areas. As Table 9 demonstrates, librarians

who are also responsible for the audiovisual program have considerably greater responsibility for everything to do with the audiovisual collection. Without exception, more than half of these people have full responsibility for all aspects of the AV program. Growing as they did from regular library situations, it is understandable that audiovisual programs be second-class, but it is time for re-structuring the management of media centers so that audiovisual specialists can assume responsibility for their own programs. The step-child days need to be ended.

C. SECTION III: Equipment Budgets[36]

Section III asks for alternate answers to the last item of Section II--the item not mentioned on the table. It was an inquiry as to who sets up the audiovisual equipment budget. Only 46 per cent of the professionals have full responsibility for their audiovisual equipment budget, and 27 per cent are not involved at all. Among those who have full responsibility, librarians account for 54 per cent. Audiovisual people account for 53 per cent of those who have partial responsibility and also the same percentage of those who are not involved with the equipment budget at all.

Section III elicited a variety of answers to the question, "If you are not involved with the AV budget, who is?" Several respondents indicated a shared responsibility--16 with the business manager, and 9 with the high school principal. Others mentioned another AV person, another

---

[36]See Appendix, p. 53.

librarian, the AV coordinator, the Superintendent, and the School Board. Because of the size of the high schools involved, it is likely that the latter two answers represent the ultimate rather than the immediate. It is not at all unusual to set up a budget and to have it slashed at almost any level.

D. SECTION IV: Production[37]

Section IV listed six of the most commonly produced materials and required a reaction. Table 10 shows the incidence of production responsibility.

TABLE 10

PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT WITH PREPARATION/PRODUCTION OF AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS

	Number of Respondents	Total % Involved	Per Cent Involved (by position) Lib/AV	AV
Transparencies	53	75	45	55
Audio tapes	42	60	31	69
Video tapes	36	50	33	67
Slides	34	48	35	65
Filmstrips	11	15	18	82
Motion pictures	11	15	27	73

Transparencies head the list of home-made materials, and Table 10 shows that three-fourths of the respondents are involved with this process. Of these, the librarians with full AV responsibility have only 45 per cent involvement.

[37]See Appendix, p. 53.

This is their highest involvement in production, however, as a careful look at the third column in Table 10 will show. AV personnel show a decided edge over library/AV people, for the subject is production. Keeping in mind that the library/AV people are filling the role of audiovisual specialist in their schools, this should be cause for concern. In short, this table indicated that those schools which have not divided their responsibilities into two positions--one library and one audiovisual--may well be getting short-changed when it comes to production of materials which are basic to growing media involvement and curricular growth within a school.

Additional items produced were written in largely by audiovisual personnel. They included charts, graphics, thermofax ditto masters, multi-media programs, multi-image productions, and slide/tape synchronization. Audiovisual people and library/AV people both mentioned production of study prints and still pictures, and library/AV personnel added only lettering, offset printing, and dry mounting to the list of items produced.

E. SECTION V: Competency[38]

"Where did you acquire competency in the AV field?" was an attempt to determine adequacy of preparation for utilization of audiovisual equipment. Respondents were asked to number their answers in order of importance. A

---

[38]See Appendix, p. 54.

large number simply checked contributing factors. These are listed in Table 11 as "not sequenced" but are included in the interest of accuracy.

TABLE 11

SOURCE OF COMPETENCY IN AUDIOVISUAL

Order of Importance	On the Job	Library Courses	In AV Courses
1	27	1	12
2	11	4	22
3	2	22	4
Not Sequenced	21	12	24
Total	61	39	62

Several other responses were written in, including prior work experience (as teacher, professional radio broadcaster, and AV Departmental Assistant at Indiana State University), Radio-TV courses, hobby, and from attending AV meetings.

Table 11 leaves no doubt as to the sense of inadequacy felt by even majors in the audiovisual field when they start a job. One respondent wrote, "My certificate says I'm qualified in audiovisual, but I sure don't feel like it." Note the solid majority which shows the job as the principal teacher. Audiovisual courses run a good second place, and library science courses just as solid a third place. The non-sequenced answers give audiovisual courses only a slight edge in frequency of listing.

The problem in university preparation is the lack of time and the growing diversity of audiovisual equipment

and materials. Nevertheless, the writer speaks from experience when testifying to the embarrassment of having to have a paraprofessional demonstrate most of the machines in the inventory. As long as Indiana licenses certify a library school graduate in audiovisual, that library school has the obligation to see to the preparation. One respondent wrote, "A lot you learn you seldom use; a lot you use was not taught in any course."

F. SECTION VI: Recommended Course Content[39]

In Section VI, respondents were asked to indicate what should be covered in an ideal audiovisual course of study. Fifteen related groupings were listed to be checked off for production, utilization, and selection/evaluation. Production and utilization were tallied as one, and the three lines concerning microforms were combined since the statistics were almost identical. Table 12 gives the percentage of respondents who recommended each grouping for inclusion in the curriculum.

---

[39]See Appendix, p. 54.

TABLE 12

RECOMMENDED COURSE CONTENT:
PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION

Unit	Percentage
Transparencies	92
Slide	89
AV equipment (projectors, recorders, record players)	88
Dry mounting/chartexing/laminating	88
Filmstrip	80
Educational TV-VTR	80
Graphics/lettering	80
Bulletin boards/posters	76
Picture lifting	74
Motion pictures	62
Microform readers	60
Flannel/magnetic board	39
Diorama/models/puppetry/papier-mache/paper sculpture	35

Production of overhead transparencies, with 92 per cent recommendation, is the most-needed skill, followed closely by slide making, dry mounting, and utilization of all kinds of equipment. The low score on the final two groups is a reminder that secondary school audiovisual personnel are being polled. The use of these methods is fairly well confined to elementary school libraries. With the exception of the last two, all received at least 60 per cent backing from these practicing audiovisual people.

Notice the slight shift of priorities when selection and evaluation become the topic in Table 13.

TABLE 13

RECOMMENDED COURSE CONTENT:
SELECTION AND EVALUATION

Unit	Percentage
AV equipment (projectors, recorders, record players)	90
Slide	80
Transparency	75
Educational TV-VTR	75
Filmstrip	75
Motion pictures	71
Dry mounting/chartexing/laminating	66
Bulletin boards/posters	64
Graphics/lettering	62
Microform readers	59
Picture lifting	45
Flannel/magnetic board	30
Diorama/models/puppetry/papier-mache/paper sculpture	25

Table 13 tabulates responses relative to selection and evaluation of equipment. Audiovisual equipment selection heads the list, having risen two per cent over the need for utilization; motion pictures has risen nine per cent in importance; and all the others have dropped in importance, as far as selection is concerned. This may well be because nowadays a media person usually finds much of the basic equipment already in the building wearing out, and he will need to replace old as well as purchase new equipment.

A ranked comparison of the two aspects of audiovisual course content should be the most effective method of determining exactly what those in the field recommend. Table 14 provides this comparison.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF THE RANK OF RECOMMENDED COURSE CONTENT

Unit	Production/ Utilization	Selection/ Evaluation
Transparency	1	3
Slide	2	2
AV equipment (projectors, recorders)	3	1
Dry mounting/chartexing/laminating	4	7
Filmstrip	5	5
Educational TV-VTR	6	4
Graphics/lettering	7	9
Bulletin board/posters	8	8
Picture lifting	9	11
Motion pictures	10	6
Microform readers	11	10
Flannel/magnetic board	12	12
Diorama/models/puppetry, etc.	13	13

Notice that there is no doubt as to top priority, although rank one and three are opposite in Production and Selection. Slides are ranked at the number two spot in both, and filmstrips rate fifth place. Bulletin boards, flannel boards, and dioramas also were ranked parallel. Aside from selection and evaluation of motion pictures, no really significant variation exists.

Referring to the percentages in Tables 12 and 13, it would seem reasonable to draw a line on Table 14 below graphics (ranked 7) in the first column (80 per cent) and below educational TV (ranked 4) in the second column (75 per cent) and consider the top seven items as essentials in audiovisual courses. Motion picture selection and evaluation at 71 per cent is a borderline but possibly important unit as well.

Two respondents suggested that production courses in slide, tape, transparency, laminating, and dry mounting be offered at the undergraduate level. Six others stressed the actual use of the machines, not just reading about them, or as one person stated, a "hands-on" experience is needed. Two suggested that selection of software be included, and three felt a definite need for VTR training. Four asked for a "how to" course on minor machinery repair, and one suggested that equipment may lie unused unless library/AV students are given training in personal relations so as to be able to relate to their faculty. This latter point is consonant with some of the insights given in the related research, for curriculum involvement depends on the audiovisual specialist's relations with his faculty, and mutual trust is imperative.

G. SECTION VII: Official Titles[40]

Section VII was set up to determine how the audiovisual personnel polled see their jobs and what titles they go by. Twenty-nine respondents are full-time librarians who also have the full responsibility for the audiovisual program, and ten are librarians who are partially audiovisual in assignment (because their program is not large enough to warrant full-time involvement). Nineteen people are full-time audiovisual, seven are primarily audiovisual but with partial library responsibility, five are part-time

---

[40]See Appendix, p. 55.

audiovisual with other responsibilities, and one is an audiovisual system coordinator. This totals 39 library-oriented people (55 per cent) and 32 who are basically audiovisual (45 per cent).

Varying official titles used by audiovisual personnel amounted to fully one-third of the responses, or 22 out of 67 replies. Among those who claim a predominantly audiovisual role, 12 are called "AV Directors" and 8 are titled "AV Coordinators." Four librarians with audiovisual responsibility are titled "AV Coordinator," and two are "AV Directors." One AV person and three librarians with AV responsibility use the title "Media Specialist," while the words "Media Center" or "Media Coordinator" figure in four other library-oriented positions. Not unexpected was the landslide of "Librarian," the title of 18 (27 per cent) of the respondents who serve in a dual capacity. Of those who are full-time audiovisual, one is called "Assistant Librarian" and two others are called "AV Librarians." Regardless of what title they bear, as is borne out in Tables 4 and 6, basic audiovisual duties are common to all who serve in that capacity.

H. SECTION VIII: Training[41]

Respondents were not polled on where they received their training but on the majors or minors in the two fields of library science and audiovisual education. A total of 126 library and audiovisual majors and minors was reported,

---

[41]See Appendix, p. 55.

65 of which were in library science and 59 in audiovisual. The 71 respondents completed a total of 45 undergraduate majors or minors and 81 graduate majors and minors. The following table displays the areas of concentration as related to the position held.

TABLE 15

TRAINING OF PERSONNEL

	Major/Minor in Lib. Sc.	Per Cent of Total	Major/Minor in AV	Per Cent of Total
Undergraduate	29	23	16	13
Graduate	36	28	45	36
Total	65	51	61	49

Table 15 shows a considerable increase of audiovisual preparation at the graduate level--36 per cent as against 13 per cent in undergraduate. This may be explained by the fact that a major or minor in audiovisual is a comparatively recent development.

Undergraduate library preparation amounted to 23 per cent of the total, whereas graduate level majors and minors accounted for only 28 per cent of the training. Graduate work in audiovisual leads graduate library work by 8 per cent among the 71 professionals polled.

Table 16 deals with the library oriented 55 per cent of the respondents. In undergraduate work, library science has a ten per cent edge, but graduate majors and minors cut this lead in half, to five per cent.

TABLE 16

TRAINING OF PERSONNEL WHO COMBINE LIBRARY AND AUDIOVISUAL RESPONSIBILITIES

	Major/Minor in Lib. Sc.	Per Cent of Total	Major/Minor in AV	Per Cent of Total
Undergraduate	22	17	9	7
Graduate	27	21	20	16
Total	49	38	29	23

Note that while graduate library science work shows a four per cent increase, those taking graduate work in audiovisual show a nine per cent increase. It would appear that these library oriented people are trying to catch up to those whose major thrust was audiovisual to begin with.

TABLE 17

TRAINING OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN FULL-TIME AUDIOVISUAL RESPONSIBILITY

	Major/Minor in Lib. Sc.	Per Cent of Total	Major/Minor in AV	Per Cent of Total
Undergraduate	7	6	7	6
Graduate	9	7	25	20
Total	16	13	32	26

Table 17 shows a remarkable increase in majors and minors taken in the field of audiovisual by the 45 per cent who are primarily audiovisually oriented. Thirteen per cent more majors and minors were reported in audiovisual graduate work over library science figures, while the undergraduate level remained the same.

Taken together, the statistics in Section VIII indicate an active participation in additional course work in the audiovisual fields. Consideration must also be given to the untallied but surely present number of audiovisual people taking additional work for either their own satisfaction or to satisfy North Central requirements for audiovisual positions. These would not necessarily amount to formal majors or minors.

One most interesting circumstance comes to light from the answers to this section. No undergraduate training in either library science or audiovisual was reported by a total of 34--nearly one-half--of the respondents. Eighteen of these are the full-time AV personnel, and the remainder are the dual function people. It was obvious that one respondent did not know the difference between undergraduate and graduate majors, but it is to be hoped that this was an exception. This writer suggests that if this proves to be a valid percentage, graduate library schools need to review their course offerings most carefully and consider inclusion of more basic courses at this level.

I. SECTION IX: General Information[42]

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, to which all the schools in this survey belong, has mandated that schools of from 300 to 1499 employ at least one full-time media specialist. Over 1500 enrollment requires two

---

[42]See Appendix, p. 55.

people.[43] In this study, the median falls at the midpoint of 1500 enrollment, and one librarian to one audiovisual person is the ratio. Two schools of 1500, one of 1600, and one of 2000 are in violation of this standard, according to the answers submitted on the questionnaires. Each of the four employs only one professional librarian. One school of 1050 enrollment employs only a half-time professional, also a violation.

There is no real connection between size of enrollment and number of professional media personnel. The physical facility, the inventory, and the instructional program determine what staffing is really necessary to run the department. Staffing at 1000 students varies from one to three media professionals, and the variation at 2000 is from one to four people. The most common staff arrangement is two people, one assigned to library and one to audiovisual. Thirty-seven schools are structured this way. Eight schools have one person who does it all, eight have one and one-half, and nine have three professionals in the combined department. Six schools have two librarians, one of whom devotes part time to audiovisual.

Table 18 gives the average number of librarians and audiovisual personnel broken down by the upper and lower halves of the enrollment range of this study.

---

[43] Policies and Standards, 1974-1975, p. 32.

TABLE 18

AVERAGE PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL PER MEDIA CENTER

Enrollment	Number of AV Professionals	Number of Librarians
1000-1500	.56	1.14
1500-2000	.82	1.49
1000-2000	.73	1.28

If an average is taken as above, there is scarcely one half-time AV person in the 1000-1500 enrollment group. The upper half of the sampling fares better with eight-tenths of an AV person. Librarians look better statistically, yet too many might well echo the comment received on one questionnaire from the only professional in a school of 1600 students: "Help! I'm losing my mind, and the semester's not over yet." Bear in mind that these who are labeled "librarians" are the ones who are serving as both librarian and audiovisual person for their building.

The size of enrollment shows no correlation to the amount of the budget. Thirteen schools report an AV budget of between $1000 and $1500. These schools range in size from 1000 to 2000 students, i. e., the entire range of the sampling, and half of these serve more than 1500 students. One school of 1200 enrollment reported a $500 budget, while one school of 1600 reported at $17,000 budget.

Although the question explicitly asked for the audiovisual budget, including both hardware and software, a number of librarians reported their total budget, books included.

Others reported that they never knew what their hardware budget would be, and some did not reply to this question. Thus, this portion of the questionnaire cannot be considered completely accurate. It will, however, serve to show the financial responsibility which devolves upon the 97 per cent of the respondents who select and order materials from these budgets (see Table 8). Table 19 will serve to give some idea of the budgets found in the schools in this study.

TABLE 19

AUDIOVISUAL BUDGET

Budget Reported in Dollars	Number of Schools	Per Cent of Total
Under 1000	1	2
1000-2000	12	21
2000-3000	15	27
3000-4000	18	32
4000-5000	4	7
5000-6000	3	5
6000-7000	1	2
Above 7000	2	4
Totals	56	100

The table makes the median range obvious: by budget size it is $3000; by median enrollment (1450) it is $3500.

In reviewing these figures given for audiovisual budgets, it might be well to keep in mind the North Central minimums.[44] Taking three spots on the sliding scale of expenditure for books, magazines and audiovisual materials, one finds the requirements listed in Table 20.

[44] Policies and Standards, 1974-1975, pp. 31-33.

TABLE 20

NORTH CENTRAL REQUIREMENTS

Enrollment	Number of Books Required	Total Book/AV Budget Required
1000	7900	$3750
1500	9900	$5250
2000	11900	$6750

With the median budget of $3000-$3500 in Table 19, it would appear that most of the audiovisual departments are receiving a fairly good proportion of their reasonable requests, unless a great deal of this money is going for equipment. It is instructive to notice the requirements for the number of books which a school media center must have. In actual practice, most Indiana librarians have to scramble to keep up or catch up with this count, and this often manages to eat into the audiovisual portion of the budget. It is easily shorted since North Central has not yet established firm criteria in the area of audiovisual hardware and software.

Although no real comparisons may be made because of the wide spread in budgets and sizes of schools, the implication is clear that media personnel are responsible for quite a lot of money. One respondent suggested that colleges provide some prior exposure to budget building and handling. With the Indiana school budgets set up for the calendar year and film rentals set up on a school year, keeping track of expenditures is at best complicated and at worst a fiasco.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has been an attempt to find out what audio-visual personnel in medium-sized Indiana public high schools actually do. In the words of one respondent, "if it lights up or makes a sound and is associated with instruction," it is AV responsibility.

Consistency in answers obtained by means of this questionnaire shows up when comparisons are made between the respondents' major responsibilities and their suggestions for course content, as in the following table.

TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL RESPONSIBILITY WITH COURSE CONTENT SUGGESTIONS

	Responsibility for Selection/Ordering (from Table 1)		Need for Courses in Selection/Ordering (from Table 13)	
	Per Cent	Rank	Per Cent	Rank
AV equipment	84	1	90	1
Dry mount	70	2	66	5
Video	60	3	75	3
Lettering	55	4	62	6
Transparency	54	5	75	3
Slide	44	6	80	2

The filmstrip, rated fifth in both Tables 12 and 13, was not in these above listings. Otherwise, the same six top items re-appear when actual use on the job and course

recommendations are compared. Note that information on equipment is a run-away first place, but the others do not necessarily follow any order. Only television ranks the same in both lists. Courses in slide selection are seen as a particular need even though current involvement is relatively low.

In order to find the operation/production similarities, Table 22 was set up.

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF OPERATING RESPONSIBILITY WITH COURSE CONTENT SUGGESTIONS

	Responsibility for Operation of Equipment (from Table 3)		Need for Courses in Production (from Table 12)	
	Per Cent	Rank	Per Cent	Rank
Dry mount	79	1	88	3
Transparency	78	2	92	1
Audio/Projectors	74	3	88	3
Lettering	56	4	80	5
Video	55	5	80	5
Slide	49	6	89	2

Again the top six items appear as in Table 14, with the exception of the filmstrip which was not included in the original listings. As in Table 21, the slide is ranked in second place as a production course need. The making of transparencies, seen as a primary production need, ran an extremely close second in actual use. In both operation and production, video rated a fifth place.

These comparisons with their high percentages underscore the parallel findings in Table 14 and should provide

audiovisual course designers with sound direction. Again, the unusually high response (76 per cent) from busy people indicates their desire to help enrich current curricular offerings in the audiovisual field.

The study determined the responsibility of audiovisual personnel in areas such as selection and ordering, scheduling and circulation, and storing and inventory of audiovisual equipment. It reviewed their responsibility for operation and repair of equipment as well as budgeting.

The extent of involvement in production of software at the high school level was instructive in that although the two categories of library/AV and audiovisual purport to perform the same functions, those who were strictly audiovisual were much more active in each of the six categories listed. This indicates a need for either additional staffing or re-alignment of priorities.

Competency in the field was acquired first on the job, secondly in audiovisual courses, and lastly in library courses. Course designers need to examine these findings closely.

Questions regarding professional background elicited statistics showing a growing amount of graduate work being done in audiovisual areas by a great many people who have no prior undergraduate work in the field.

As far as title goes, 31 per cent still go by the title "Librarian," while "AV Director" or "AV Coordinator" were the two most common terms for the person with audiovisual orientation--a total of 39 per cent of the responses.

Size of school, budget, and professional staff provided a background for the study, but no conclusive composite could be drawn from the widely divergent data received. Since these findings are adequately discussed in the body of the paper, no summary will be attempted here.

The principal purpose of the research was to obtain knowledgeable input for course design. Table 14 gives full ratings, and Tables 21 and 22 validate the earlier findings. The six audiovisual units rated most important by practicing Indiana high school audiovisual personnel are: dry mounting; transparency making; the utilization of all kinds of recorders, phonographs, and projectors; lettering techniques; television production; and slide making.

This study centered upon a size group (enrollment 1000-2000) most likely to have equipment. Further study might poll schools below 1000 students to investigate the equipment available in the smaller and definitely one-librarian schools. A more detailed background search, requesting semester hours and universities where training was received could be helpful in determining whose audiovisual training courses are actually providing adequate preparation and might assist in setting reasonable standards. The writer is, however, more than satisfied with the response and findings of this study and feels that it has fulfilled its purpose.

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

Case, Robert N. and Anna Mary Lowrey. Behavioral Requirements Analysis Checklist Phase II. Chicago: ALA, 1973. 60 pages.

Gaver, Mary Virginia. Services of Secondary School Media Centers. Chicago: ALA, 1971. 131 pages.

Kortendick, James J. and Elizabeth W. Stone. Job Dimensions and Educational Needs in Librarianship. Chicago: ALA, 1971. 503 pages.

School Library Manpower Project. Occupational Definitions for School Library Media Personnel. Chicago: ALA, 1971. 24 pages.

School Library Manpower Project. School Library Personnel Task Analysis Survey. Chicago: ALA, 1969. 91 pages.

School Library Manpower Project. Task Analysis Survey Instrument. Chicago: ALA, 1969. 15 pages.

B. Periodicals

Aaron, Shirley Louise. "A Review of Selected Research Studies in School Librarianship 1967-1971: Part II." School Media Quarterly. 1:41-48; Fall, 1972.

Adams, Charles W. "The School Media Program: A Position Statement." School Media Quarterly. 2:127-132, 141-143; Winter, 1974.

Atkins, Neil P. "Leadership and Support for School Media Programs." School Media Quarterly. 2:15-18; Fall, 1973.

"Audiovisual." College Management. 8:9-10; March, 1973.

Baughman, James C. "The Meaning of the Standards for School Media Programs." School Media Quarterly. 1:274-277; Summer, 1973.

Borich, Gary D. "Quantitative Standards for Instructional Media: What Are Their Effects?" AV Guide. 51:8-9; March, 1972.

Boylan, Michael W. "The Media Specialist and Student Involvement With Media." Drexel Library Quarterly. 9:47-57; July, 1973.

Brumback, Elsie L. "The Open-Classroom Concept and Its Effect on the School Library (Media) Program." Virginia Librarian. 19:3-4; Spring, 1972.

Christensen, J. A. "Of Teachers, Then, Now, and Classroom Media Aids." Media and Methods. 9:32,36,80-81; February, 1973.

Clark, Geraldine. "Secondary School Libraries, Problems, Problems, Problems." School Library Journal. 19:76-77; March, 1973.

Colson, John C. "Modifying Library School Curricula." RQ. 12:267-272; Spring, 1973.

Damio, Roger. "Media Maximus." Media and Methods. 9:48-55; May, 1973.

Darling, Richard L., and others. "IMC--Library Services." Instructor. 77:83-94; November, 1967.

Dukiet Kenneth H. "A Look at Statistics for Instructional Materials and Equipment Expenditures by Higher Education." College Management. 8:9-11,13; October, 1973.

Fite, Robert E. "Audiovisual Certification: Tell It Like It is." AV Guide. 51:14-15; December, 1972.

Forcier, Richard C. and Alfred D. Grant. "Systems Design Team: Personal Relationships in Instructional Development." Educational Technology. 13:58; March, 1973.

Gaver, Mary Virginia. "Services in Secondary School Media Centers: A Second Appraisal." School Libraries. 20:15-20; Fall, 1970.

Greider, Janice M. "I. T.: Its Effect on Media Centers." Audiovisual Instruction. 18:33; June, 1973.

Gunselman, Marshall. "Learning by Doing with Media." Learning Today. 6:41-47; Winter, 1973.

Healey, James S. "A Road to Media Relevancy." Journal of Education for Librarianship. 13:104-110; February, 1972.

Hill, Michael. "Media Services: A Department in Transition." Illinois Libraries. 55:474-75; September, 1973.

Hostrop, Richard W. "Using Media in the Library." Educational Technology. 12:59-60; July, 1972.

Lewis, Phillip. "Creative Teacher Corps Helps Sunnyvale Cut Software Cost." Nations Schools. 91:88-92; January, 1973.

Lindeman, Dr. Le Roy R. and John E. Gillespie, Jr. "Multimedia: Essential Component for Disseminating Educational Excellence." AV Guide. 52:18-20; January, 1973.

"Local Production Revisited." Audiovisual Instruction. 18:4; November, 1973.

Mahar, Mary Helen. "Evaluation of Media Services to Children and Young People in Schools." Library Trends. 22:377-385; January, 1974.

Mayo, Don. "Role of the Library Media Specialist." Audiovisual Instruction. 19:39; June, 1974.

Meyers, Judith K. "Media Services in the Open School: An Overview." Drexel Library Quarterly. 9:9-26; July, 1973.

Miller, Hannah Elsas. "A Working Media Center: An All-Media Approach to Learning." Audiovisual Instruction. 19:59-60; February, 1974.

Moorehead, Joe. "The Theory Practice Problem and Library-Centered Education." Journal of Education for Librarianship. 14:119-127; Fall, 1973.

Myers, Alpha S. "Media Centers and Innovation." Audiovisual Instruction. 18:77-80; March, 1973.

"NAVA Institute Seminar Report: Future Media." AV Guide. 52:12-13; January, 1973.

Orne, Jerrold. "Standards in Library Technology." Library Trends. 21:286-297; October, 1972.

Palmer, Millicent. "Creating Slide-Tape Library Instruction: the Librarian's Role." Drexel Library Quarterly. 8:251-267; July, 1972.

Penland, Patrick R. "Beyond the Formalities." School Media Quarterly. 1:182-190; Spring, 1973.

Penn, Vivian-Sue. "One Dozen Tried and Inexpensive Little Ideas Observed in the Travels of a Media-Center Specialist and Free for the Copying." Wilson Library Bulletin. 48:51-53; September, 1973.

"Pennsylvania, Nebraska Educators Win 1974 Media Training Awards." Audiovisual Instruction. 19:66-67; June, 1974.

Peterson, Gary T. "Graduates of Media Programs in 1972-73." Audiovisual Instruction. 19:26-28; March, 1974.

----------. "Instructional Media Graduates 1971-72." Audiovisual Instruction. 18:41-43; May, 1973.

Pillon, Nancy B. "Media Specialists Work With Teachers." Drexel Library Quarterly. 9:59-69; July, 1973.

Quigley, Edward J. "Boardman to Boardman: AV's Fine, But Not If It Makes Books Unimportant." American School Board Journal. 160:53-54; February, 1973.

Quinlan, Iola. "Developing Effective Library Media Centers--Now." Illinois Libraries. 55:479-485; September, 1973.

"Ralph Conant--In Pursuit of Library Education." American Libraries. 4:663; December, 1973.

Randall, Warren. "School Facilities AV Checklist." Audiovisual Instruction. 18:16-17; December, 1973.

Richards, Milton. "Instructional Technology: Problems and Prospects." Educational Forum. 38:4; May, 1974.

Schatz, Anne E. and June Sharp. "Organizing the Multimedia Facility for Individualized Instruction." Journal of Business Education. 48:155; January, 1973.

Scott, Marilynn S. "Competency-based Evaluation for Media Personnel." Audiovisual Instruction. 19:45; June, 1974.

Simmons, Beatrice D. "Librarian: Instructional Programmer." Drexel Library Quarterly. 8:247-250; July, 1972.

Tanzman, Jack. "AV at College Becomes Educational Technology." College Management. 8:26,27,33; October, 1973.

Tiemann, Philip W. and Susan M. Markle. "Teacher and Technology-As-Media or Technology-As-System: Implications of 'To Improve Learning' for Teacher Training." Educational Technology. 8:7; August, 1972.

Tobin, Jayne Culver. 'A Study of Library 'Use' Studies." Information Storage and Retrieval. 10:101-113; March/April, 1974.

Topper, Louis. "Some Problems and Pointers for those Introducing AV Materials into the Library." Wilson Library Bulletin. 47:42-45; September, 1972.

Totten, Herman L. "Library Education and Non-Print Media: Where It's At." Journal of Education for Librarianship. 13:182-187; Winter, 1973.

Totten, Herman and Martin L. Mitchell. "Scope and Content of Non-Print Media Courses Taught in Graduate Library Schools." Journal of Education for Librarianship. 14:58-66; Summer, 1973.

Ward, Phyllis. "Where to Kick." Audiovisual Instruction. 19:2-4; March, 1974.

White, Howard S. "Library Technology in the '70's." Wilson Library Bulletin. 47:748-752; May, 1973.

Wildberger, Mary Elizabeth. "Programs for Developing Resources in Media Centers." Audiovisual Instruction. 17:38,40; December, 1972.

C. Bulletins

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Policies and Standards for the Approval of Secondary Schools, 1974-1975. Chicago, 1974.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. News. January 16, 1975. 3 pages.

D. Interview

Axeen, Dr. Marina, Chairman of the Department of Library Science, Ball State University. February 3, 1975.

VII. APPENDIX

A. Letter to Respondents

January 8, 1975

Dear Librarian:

It is with some reluctance that I send this research questionnaire across your already overcrowded desk, but only those of us who have faced audiovisual responsibilities can help provide data for the practical education of future candidates.

The purpose of this study is twofold: to identify the various kinds of media or audiovisual responsibilities performed by a librarian in a medium-sized Indiana public high school library; and to make recommendations as to the contents of a model audiovisual course to meet the needs of practitioners in the field.

I would appreciate a reply from each professional involved with AV in your school library organization, along with any comments you might care to add. Your input is vital to the study (as well as to my grade). Please return to me in the enclosed envelope by January 30, at the latest.

Many thanks,

(Mrs.) Barbara Pugh, AV Librarian
Muncie Southside High School
Special Graduate Student
Department of Library Science
Ball State University

Enclosures

P.S. Hey! Wait a minute! Don't put this in your file drawer. It will take only about five minutes, and it won't hurt you to get a good deed in early this year. I'll even answer a questionnaire for you sometime.

B. Questionnaire

I. Your responsibility regarding AV equipment selection, scheduling, etc. PLEASE CHECK ALL APPLICABLE ITEMS:

Types of Equipment	Select./ Order	Sched./ Circ.	Storing/ Inventory	Operated by you or under your direction	Minor repairs (bulbs,etc.)	Major repairs
Audio (disc/tape)	60	59	61	53	54	2
Video	39	44	44	39	28	1
Projection (8mm, 16mm, 35mm) opaque, overhead	55	59	61	51	58	4
Duplicating (incl. thermofax,xerox,etc.)	34	26	33	41	32	1
Dry mount	52	42	53	55	33	2
Microform readers (microfilm/fiche)	30	28	33	33	36	1
Still cameras	38	30	36	32	19	
Movie cameras	27	24	32	28	19	
Transparency makers (thermofax,diazo,etc.)	42	30	43	54	29	1
Slide makers (copy stand, etc.)	33	25	35	34	20	
Filmstrip makers	11	7	10	10	7	
Darkroom/photography	17	12	18	20	12	
Lettering sets	42	33	41	39	23	1
Laminators	36	29	38	42	25	1
Others--specify and check applicable columns						

II. Please indicate the extent of your responsibility:

	Full responsibility (by you or under your direction)	Partial responsibility	Not involved
Setting up AV software budget	34	21	12
Selecting and ordering software (including rental)	47	17	2
Evaluating/previewing software	38	26	4
Cataloging software	43	16	8
Storing software	49	18	1
Circulating software	48	17	1
Inventory of software	52	15	
Setting up AV equipment budget	28	17	17

III. If you are not involved with the AV budget, who is?

__1__ another librarian

__4__ another AV person

____ a teacher

__9__ school principal

__16__ business manager

____ a committee

__10__ other (specify)

IV. Do you prepare or supervise the production of the following:

__53__ transparencies

__34__ slides

__11__ filmstrips

__11__ motion pictures

__42__ audio tapes

__36__ video tapes

____ others (specify)

V. Where did you acquire competency in the AV field? Please number in order of importance.

____on the job

____in Library science course/s

____in AV course/s

____other (specify)

VI. Based on your practical needs and experience, what are the units that an ideal audiovisual course should consist of? PLEASE CHECK ALL APPLICABLE ITEMS.

Units	Production	Utilization	Selection/ Evaluation	All of these
Bulletin board/poster	53	54	45	
Flannel/magnetic board	27	27	21	
Graphics/lettering	57	56	44	
Diorama/models/puppetry/ papier-mache/paper sculpt.	22	25	18	
Dry mounting/chartexing/ laminating	64	60	47	
Picture lifting	55	48	32	
Transparency	67	62	53	
Filmstrip	56	57	53	
Slide	62	61	56	
Motion picture	39	49	50	
Educational TV - VTR	55	58	53	
AV equipment (projectors, recorders,record players)	47	62	63	
Microform	19	43	42	
Microfilm reader/printer	19	44	42	
Microfiche reader/printer	18	42	38	
Other AV units (specify and check columns)				

VII. Your official title:_____

29 full library and AV responsibility combined

10 librarian with partial AV responsibility

19 full-time AV

7 full-time AV with partial library responsibility

VIII. Your training:

Library Science	Audiovisual
9 undergraduate major	3 undergraduate major
29 undergraduate minor	13 undergraduate minor
27 graduate major	26 graduate major
9 graduate minor	19 graduate minor

Other:_____

IX. Your high school:

Member of North Central Association?_____

Approximate enrollment_____ Grades_____

No. of professional librarians: full time_____ part time_____

No. of professional AV personnel: full time_____ part time_____

Approximate size of your AV budget including hardware and software (not Title II):

____below $500	____$2000-$2500
____$500-$1000	____$2500-$3000
____$1000-$1500	____$3000-$3500
____$1500-$2000	____over $3500 Specify:_____

X. Thank you very much for helping with this research. Additional comments may be written below.